
Minutes

Board of Natural Resources

April 1, 2003
Natural Resources Building, Olympia, Washington

BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT

Bob Nichols for Governor Gary Locke

Terry Bergeson, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Glen Huntingford, Commissioner, Jefferson County

Bruce Bare, Dean, University of Washington, College of Forest Resources

James Zuiches, Dean, Washington State University, College of Agriculture & Home Economics

(Dean Zuiches Chaired the Meeting)

BOARD MEMBERS ABSENT

Doug Sutherland, Commissioner of Public Lands

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Zuiches called the meeting to order at 9:05 a.m. on Tuesday, April 1, 2003, in Room 172 of the Natural Resources Building.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MOTION: Glen Huntingford moved to approve March 4, 2003, Board of Natural Resources Meeting Minutes.

SECOND: Terry Bergeson seconded.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

Chair Zuiches indicated a change in the agenda sequence. Immediately following public comments, Chair Reports will begin, then the Land Transactions.

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR AGENDA ACTION ITEMS

None made.

CHAIR REPORTS

Sustainable Harvest Calculation Briefing (Handout 1)

Bruce Mackey, Lands Steward, and Angus Brodie presented. Mr. Brodie reminded the Board that they had several requests at the February Board meeting that he intended to address, 1) a description of the

alternatives, 2) how the results will be evaluated, 3) how the OESF will be dealt with in the EIS, and 4) concerns the Board raised about the proposed dropping of Alternative 7.

Mr. Brodie gave overview of the timeline and how he would be explaining the alternatives:

He will describe and evaluate Alternatives 1 & 2 today

Alternatives 3 & 4 in May

Alternatives 5 & 6 in June

Draft results in July

Publication of Draft EIS in August

Bob Nichols asked when the Board will begin examining the “mixing and matching” approach?

Mr. Brodie said it would come when the draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) is released for public review. The modeling results, information from the DEIS, and public input will be available then. He continued with the presentation, describing the EIS alternatives as alternatives that represent suites of policy and management strategies for achieving Department goals. Evaluating criteria - the purpose of the Department’s management of trust forest lands is to generate revenue and habitat management. Both are achieved using socially responsible land management practices. Revenue generation from trust forest lands is largely generated from the sale of timber, therefore we can describe and look at the sale of timber in a portfolio (Slides 6 & 7 show graphs of average annual timber sale bid value portfolio and evaluation criteria).

Mr. Brodie moved to key policy and strategies for revenue generation in Alternative 1 (Slide 8). We expect to maintain the size and shape of distribution; sustainable even-flow; 60-year rotation; even-age silviculture; green-up; visual management; etc.

Terry Bergeson wondered if outside sources such as the market shifts that Jon Tweeddale observes, as well as other external forces, would be built into the model, given we use the same protocols and same management practices?

Mr. Brodie said no, they are based on DNR practices. The way we are modeling is based on key policies and key management strategies.

Terry Bergeson asked if it was possible to incorporate external forces and begin to predict trends under those practices?

Mr. Brodie said that the communication between the programs is tied together to ensure the strategic look at land base and marketing has one basic path. He then pointed out that what he is showing the Board today is a specific look at key policies.

Alternative 1 (Slide 8) is a no-action alternative so if there was no change to the Forest Resources Plan (FRP) or the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP), or any of the procedures, the expectation is that this distribution will be maintained.

Alternative 2 (Slide 9) has much of the same strategies for revenue generation as Alternative 1, with the exception of increased management in habitat areas, particularly in Nesting, Roosting, Foraging (NRF) and dispersal areas, and the owl circles. Owl circles become available for silvicultural activities and harvesting where they don’t become available in Alternative 1.

Bob Nichols questioned the statement “Board of Natural Resources approved forestry” asking if that means that these are new actions that will need to be approved by the Board of Natural Resources?

Mr. Brodie said Alternative 2 implements many of the strategies in the HCP and looks at current management strategies in the Forestry Handbook and changes a number of those so that we can do more active management on a greater part of the landscape.

Mr. Mackey added that we are removing some of the restrictions that were put into the handbook.

Bob Nichols wondered if the approval of those removals would be a Board action, i.e., Alternative 1 is a no-action alternative and Alternative 2 implies the Board is proactive.

Glen Huntingford rephrased the question by asking - if the direction from the Board is to use the HCP to better manage the forest, would that take action from the Board to implement that, or can you, as staff, use the HCP to do better silviculture practices under the HCP?

Mr. Mackey said there are two answers, 1) the Board will choose the sustainable harvest calculation and the policies to direct that, and 2) the difference between Alternative 1 and Alternative 2 are the procedures that were put in place by the previous administration and we would have to go through SEPA to remove those. If this becomes an alternative that the Board considers as a final, then we will be going through the SEPA and EIS process to do that. In theory, staff can do that without the Board's approval because the Board will have already approved the policies. Alternative 2 has already been approved by the Board and is the current procedure to operate under.

Bruce Bare asked if there was a slide available that shows the big matrix for all of the alternatives?

Mr. Brodie said that he will be back before the Board at the next two meetings and describe the expectations for Alternatives 3 & 4, then 5 & 6. He continued with the key Forest Resource Plan policies: ownership group doesn't change; rotation age doesn't change; silviculture doesn't change; and strategies don't change. Key things that have changed: management in riparian areas; management of NRF and dispersal areas; and owl circles. Considering Alternative 2, the intent is to increase the land base to manage, therefore increase volume and revenue. The assumption is that the distribution won't change.

He continued with habitat management (Slide 10) on trust forest lands developed under the HCP. A target distribution was developed in the HCP; age class was used as surrogate for habitat (there are some severe limitations with that); and structure is what is intended.

Slide 11 showed a graph of estimated current stand stage conditions (DNR managed forest lands for Western Washington only): Open; Regeneration; Pole; Closed; Complex; and Fully Functional.

Open

Earliest stage; over story removed; dominated by herbs, forbs, and young trees.

Regeneration

Shrubs and saplings; braches beginning to intertwine; dense canopy from ground up.

Pole

Early stages of stem exclusion; stem closely spaced and numerous; very little under story.

Bob Nichols pointed out that he has always associated the term “Pole” to be a specific timber type, but in this context it is referencing a stage structure called “Pole”. He wondered where the term came from?

Mr. Brodie said it came from the HCP but he doesn’t think the terms really describe what is happening on the ground.

Bruce Bare suggested to put a parenthesis behind the terms with the definition following.

Mr. Brodie agreed to do that. He then continued with the list of stand conditions.

Closed

Undergone some mortality; still in stem exclusion; some canopy differentiation; lacking complex structures.

Terry Bergeson asked if this is a restrictive set of conditions for habitat?

Mr. Brodie said it depends on the species.

Complex

Stocked with large trees; variety of diameters and heights; under story initiation; snags, down woody debris presence.

Fully Functional

As with complex stage but more mature and structurally complex.

Mr. Brodie moved to Slide 18, describing the targets for the stand stages. The expectation is that policies and management strategies will produce more complex stand structures into the future. The evaluation criteria is cost, revenue, time, and environmental impacts.

Bruce Bare asked when we expect to hit the target?

Mr. Brodie said that the HCP document expected to reach the targets 100 years out. He then continued with two general strategies for developing complex forest structures:

1) Natural Disturbances - wind; fire; pests; disease; and aging. Uncertainty about where and when these things will occur.

2) Silvicultural Disturbances - thinning; accelerated mortality; snag retention; under-planting. More certainty about where and when these things will occur.

Bruce Bare asked if natural disturbances are modeled?

Mr. Brodie said that most natural disturbance modeling is based around age. He then continued with key policy and strategies for habitat management for Alternatives 1 & 2.

Alternative 1 (Slide 21): will rely largely on natural disturbances to produce complex forest structures because the strategies for riparian areas would have little intervention other than access. For NRF and dispersal it is a hands-off approach. The expectation is that the development will be linked to time, and habitat growth will be slow and will occur through the aging process.

Alternative 2 (Slide 22): will rely on silviculture (particularly in NRF and dispersal areas) and natural disturbances to produce complex forest structures. As we use silviculture, we expect these stages to develop sooner.

Bruce Bare asked if Mr. Brodie would be showing a graph such as Slide 22 in July with all six alternatives by decade, so the Board can see how the forest structure distribution changes?

Mr. Brodie said yes.

Bruce Bare asked Mr. Brodie to provide a quick summary on how he classifies stands?

Mr. Brodie said it is based around live tree and decadence (dead trees) characteristics. The system is driven primarily by diameter class, amount of canopy closure or density of the stand, and the number of tree layers within the stand.

Jim Zuiches asked what unit of land that classification would be applied to?

Mr. Brodie said it is applied to a forest stand level (a basic inventory unit) which is an average of 40 to 50 acres.

Bruce Bare asked what kind of silviculture Mr. Brodie anticipates applying to the "Pole" stands to get them out of their condition?

Mr. Brodie indicated that in Alternative 1, if the Pole stands are not in NRF and dispersal or riparian areas, they will receive some uniform standard of thinning. In Alternative 2, a uniform thinning as well, but in the NRF and dispersal and riparian areas we anticipate a type of variable density thinning with additional retention and silvicultural features. Later, in Alternative 6, we will do biodiversity pathway thinnings where we will do heavier thinnings at the earlier stages of the Pole stands and lighter thinning later on, extending the rotation ages out.

Mr. Brodie summarized with statements about the two alternatives:

Alternative 1: no action alternative (current operations); expectations are to maintain current revenue portfolio and current distribution, and habitat development with natural process.

Alternative 2: BNR approved forestry policies and changes to some of the management strategies and procedures; expectations are to increase current revenue portfolio size; maintain current revenue portfolio shape; faster habitat development as a result of active management and silvicultural investments.

Terry Bergeson suggested that the statement "BNR approved forestry" should be revised to eliminate misinterpretation.

Mr. Brodie agreed. He finished his presentation stating that he will come before the Board in May to describe Alternatives 3 & 4 in the same format as today's presentation.

Bob Nichols asked when the technical review committee will appear before the Board to offer their perspective?

Mr. Brodie said July or August.

Terry Bergeson pointed out that the Board would be making their decisions at that time.

Mr. Mackey said the Board would be making their decisions in September.

Bob Nichols indicated that the publication of the DEIS would be in August so he asked what decisions Mr. Mackey was referring to?

Mr. Mackey said once the Board has the DEIS results, public input, and feedback from the technical review committee, they would make a decision on a preferred alternative through mixing and matching the DEIS alternatives. The preferred alternative would then be put through the final EIS. On the current timeline, that is approximately September. He asked the Board when a discussion with the technical review committee would be the most helpful to them? To help them decide, he indicated that the draft results in July are the draft results of the modeling, and they won't include the environmental impact assessment. He advised them that they would probably want both of those to make a decision.

Terry Bergeson said she was expecting to hear from the technical review committee in late spring. She stressed the importance of hearing a non-DNR perspective so the Board is well informed on decision day.

Mr. Brodie said they recently had a meeting with the committee and another meeting is scheduled for the beginning of June. He agreed to ask the committee if they could attend the June Board meeting.

Jim Zuiches said it would be good timing to hear from the committee after all six alternatives have been presented to the Board.

Lake Whatcom Landscape Plan Process Update

Jack Hulsey - Upland Region Operations Manager, provided a brief update. He indicated that they had anticipated giving a complete report today, but the committee had the need for additional time. At next month's Board meeting there will be a complete report on a preferred alternative. A substantial amount of work has been done by the committee, and DNR has benefited a great deal from the policy and legal input from the Department of Health, the Department of Ecology, and most recently, an appointed member of the State Fish & Wildlife Rich Costello, has added much to the committee.

Bruce Bare asked if the committee will be using the same stand structure system being used in the sustainable harvest?

Mr. Hulsey said yes. The previous information will be elaborated upon based on the work done by Angus Brodie, the SHC technical review committee, and input and information gained through public process.

Break 10:25

Reconvened 10:40

LAND TRANSACTIONS

Meadow Springs Residential Land Bank Sale #02-73682 Resolution #1061 (Handout 2)

Julie Armbruster presented. She reviewed a list of all of the Tri-Cities transactions (Slide 2). She showed the Meadow Springs property on a map indicating that the section was divided into 4 tracts. She provided a history of the property indicating the sale was originally for 73 acres and valued at \$1 million dollars. A few days before the October auction it was discovered that the information the department had about the availability of water to the property was incorrect. The property was pulled from auction rather

than be perceived as misleading bidders. At the same time, some citizens protested that sale stating that the property should be preserved as open space and the wasteway needed to be protected. They wanted the sale to be subject to SEPA action, and some wanted the Department of Transportation (DOT) to purchase the property as mitigation for a road widening project occurring in Benton County. Due to the issues raised, the property was included in the January 2003 public meeting which residents opposed the sale on the grounds that the property constitutes open space and habitat that should be preserved. Much attention was focused on the creek, which some claimed as salmon bearing. At the January meeting, DNR was also presented a letter from DOT stating their interest in purchasing the parcel (Tracts 2 & 3) subject to funding availability and mitigation criteria.

Ms. Armbruster brought up one other issue regarding Tract 4. During the public process, the city of Kennewick expressed interest in purchasing Tract 4. After the public meeting, they were no longer interested in Tract 4 in its entirety, they only had interest in a few acres to expand a city park. We discussed the situation with staff from Richland Parks, DOT, and F&W, and decided to hold Tract 4 and the wasteway for possible transfer to DOT, Parks, or some combination and re-offer Tracts 2 & 3 for public auction. While some neighbors will continue to be unhappy about the prospect of the property being developed, DNR has held out the possibility of turning the creek and some of the adjacent property over to DOT so they can provide habitat enhancement.

Characteristics of the sale: property is now 57.8 acres; common school land; zoned low density-single family residential (3 lots per acre); within Richland city limits in urban growth boundary; re-appraised at \$885,000.

Benefits of the sale: disposes of urban property in a location where the market demand is high; disposes of property that is difficult to manage and generates no revenue; provides ability to reinvest trust dollars into income-producing property. The Department recommends approval.

Bob Nichols asked what will happen to the wasteway?

Ms. Armbruster said that DNR will continue to own it and DOT may purchase the wasteway at a later date as well as part of Tract 4.

Bob Nichols asked what interest DOT would have in buying the wasteway?

Ms. Armbruster said according to F&W, with some habitat enhancement, it would meet the criteria for DOT to buy mitigation lands for their projects when wetlands are destroyed elsewhere.

Chair Zuiches asked who owns the wasteway above Broadmore Street?

Ms. Armbruster indicated it is an easement that goes with whomever owns the underlying fee.

Glen Huntingford asked about the options for Tract 4, i.e., park expansion, etc. If DNR sells part of that Tract, what will they do with the remaining section? Will it become problematic to sell?

Ms. Armbruster said a solution will be worked out with the interested agencies.

Bruce Bare pointed out the original sale encompassing 73 acres for \$1 million and now the sale consists of 57.8 acres at \$885,000. He asked if we are now getting more per acre?

Ms. Armbruster explained that in the original \$1 million calculation the wasteway acres were minimal. They were considered low value because all the value was attributed to the developable acres. What affected the value is that whomever buys the property now will need to get a special water permit, and according to the appraiser, he estimates it will take up to a year to obtain a water permit and there will be a holding cost so that dropped the price.

Bruce Bare asked if there was any solicitation of public input on the revision? He wondered if people were more favorable now?

Ms. Armbruster little has been heard from the public, but favorable comments came from other agencies.

MOTION: Glen Huntingford moved to approve Resolution #1061.

SECOND: Terry Bergeson seconded.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

McCool 40 Trust Land Transfer #02-073232 Resolution #1062 (Handout 3)

Evert Challstedt began with an update on the Trust Land Transfer program and highlighted the remaining transfers for the May and June Board meetings. Ten of eighteen transfers have been approved by the Board and two were presented today. The remaining six properties are under appraisal contracts and will be brought forward in May and June.

The McCool property is an isolated 40-acre parcel in Clallum County situated 3 miles west of Sequim and just north of Highway 101. It is zoned for residential development and is forested with 60-year old conifer and hardwood. Access is through county or private land. The property is adjacent to the county Robin Hill Farm Park and is to be transferred to Clallum County for expansion of the park. The property was appraised by a third-party appraiser who determined the highest and best use was for residential development. The appraised value of the timber is \$185,000 and the land is \$220,000 for a total value of \$405,000. Benefits: provides funds for school construction (timber value) and funds for land replacement (land value). Clallum County gains property to expand a public park. A deed restriction will be placed on the property as provided by legislation to maintain the property in open space or recreation for a period of 30 years. The Department recommends approval.

MOTION: Terry Bergeson moved to approve Resolution #1062.

SECOND: Glen Huntingford seconded.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

Valley Creek North Trust Land Transfer #02-073225 Resolution #1063 (Handout 4)

Evert Challstedt presented the proposed transfer of 80 acres of Common School Trust land to the City of Port Angeles. The property is located on the southern edge of the City and includes the deep ravine forming Valley Creek. The portion of the property within the City is zoned for residential development while the property within the County is zoned for Public Use, a zone reserved by the County for public parks. The appraiser determined the highest and best use for the property was for residential development. The property is timbered with 60-70 year conifer. The appraised value of the timber is \$197,000 and the land is \$265,000 for a total value of \$462,000. Benefits: provides funds for school construction (timber value), and funds for land replacement (land value); and the City of Port Angeles gains property for open space and recreation. A deed restriction will be placed on the property as

provided for by legislation to maintain the property in open space or recreation for 30 years. The Department recommends approval.

MOTION: Glen Huntingford moved to approve Resolution #1063.

SECOND: Terry Bergeson seconded.

DISCUSSION: Glen Huntingford was curious about the County already having the property zoned for a park. He asked if it is currently being used for a park?

Mr. Challstedt was unsure when or why the zoning occurred. The County maintains a trail system on one portion of the property.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

Chair Zuiches noted the 6 items remaining on the TLT list and asked for a timetable.

Mr. Challstedt agreed to provide it.

TIMBER SALES

Proposed Timber Sales for May 2003 (Handout 5)

Jon Tweedale - Product Sales Manager, provided overview stating he will provide market update; March 2003 sales results; FY03 volume projection; and May 2003 proposed sales.

Market Update - indicated that the market continues to be plagued with oversupply. Domestic production is up 5.4%, non-Canadian lumber imports are up 39%, which is a small percentage of the 56 billion board feet per year of consumption that the US has. Canada has had record imports to the US this year up 2% from previous years. The housing market is best it's been in over 16 years. Very strong demand for finished product but supply still outpaces the demand and thus overall lumber profits are at a 10-year low.

March 2003 Sales Results - 17 sales were offered (57 mmbf) and 15 sold (55.2mmbf) for an average price of \$296 mbf, which was 44% above our appraisal. The average number of bidders was 4. Mr. Tweedale continued with sale highlights including King Mountain Forest Health sale, which sold 11.4 mbf selling for almost 122% above our appraisal. He brought up the Allegro sale in SW because he wanted to point out an interesting aspect to the sale - Mike Chandler and Pat Ryan, in the marketing group, implemented electronic advertising as part of DNR's overall strategy in marketing. There is a database of sawmills in the system and within that database, each mill has a specific commodity of log that they purchase. Each month, Mr. Tweedale's team goes through each sale, separates each sale by its predominant commodity, they then match up the database with the month's sales and send an email to the mills that may be interested in the log types. In doing this, Herbert Lumber out of Riddle Oregon, purchased the Allegro sale. The way the company heard about the sale was through the email advertising. He commended his marketing staff for their creativity and implementation of this sales tool. There were 10 bidders on that sale with a 55% overbid.

Glen Huntingford asked how long the marketing team had been doing the electronic email?

Mr. Tweedale said the matching up of buyers with timber sales has been in progress for 5 or 6 months.

Bruce Bare asked what percent of the volume sold in March was sold outside the state?

Mr. Tweedale said he would bring that information to the Board next month.

FY 03 Volume Projection - volume sold to date is 363 mmbf; we are on target to sell 550 mmbf; we are going to offer 560 mmbf.

Proposed May 2003 Sales - 29 sales being offered (86.2 mmbf); \$16.5 million (average \$191 mbf). There are thinnings, partial cuts, and a good mix of Forest Health sales.

Glen Huntingford brought up his analysis of the SEPA review, drawing attention to the Bear Claw sale in Okanogan County. He pointed out the concern from people over the amount of harvest and was impressed with the response from John Viada - Northeast Region Manager, and how he stood behind the existing Lynx Plan. He thought Mr. Viada did an excellent job in articulating the Department's objectives regarding the Lynx Plan and how they fit into that sale.

Chair Zuiches noted that there were a number of letters raising concerns about the Lynx and F&W responded that DNR is in compliance with the Lynx Plan, but that we should monitor the situation.

Mr. Tweedale added that staff went out several times on tours and did some minor redesign.

Bruce Bare brought up a letter the Board received regarding the Jorgeson timer sale and asked when that sale would be coming forward?

Mr. Tweedale said that sale would be coming forward in May or June.

MOTION: Terry Bergeson moved to approve 2003 May Timber Sales.

SECOND: Bruce Bare seconded.

ACTION: Motion passed unanimously.

Terry Bergeson wanted to recognize Mr. Tweedale and his staff for the creative work they have been doing with marketing, and not just with numbers and analysis, but building relationships with people both inside the department and with the public.

Mr. Tweedale appreciated the comments and added that the regions and his staff deserve the credit and he would pass along the recognition.

Chair Zuiches concurred with Terry's comments adding that in many of the sales that have concerns raised by citizens, the SEPA provides a good response and explanation, and he appreciates always seeing good follow-up by staff. The argument and rationale is clearly laid out for the recommendations, and that is important for the Board - to know that the appropriate mitigation has been undertaken and there has been follow through with what is expected or promised. It is a vital part of this process.

Terry Bergeson added that the ability to inform people on the technical side of things is going well, but the ability to develop better relationships with potential buyers is outstanding. Providing good communication with the buyers about what they're getting for their dollar i.e., it may cost them more but they will get more for the dollar they pay, and making it clear that the deal being made is focused on their profit as well as providing the fiduciaries better revenue generated from the sale. It's a win-win approach to the negotiations and that, tied with the good technical work, is a success.

Mr. Tweedale stated that it is all about relationships and that is where the market is moving. He appreciated the point.

BOARD DISCUSSION

Lake Whatcom Discussion

Terry Bergeson brought up the earlier Lake Whatcom presentation. She pointed out that the plan was supposed to be done in 2001 and it is now 2003, and there is still no plan with agreement. She then referenced a letter from Steve Hood stating that there may be some disagreements. She stressed that there has been a great deal of work done by DNR staff and a lot of involvement from the community. From the Board's perspective, the law has been followed, staff has tried to accommodate all concerns involved, and done additional work based on community concerns. She pointed out that there is a balance in terms of the Board's role as fiduciaries and this cannot go beyond what the law says. She stated that she admired the community concern and valued the discussions and open communication, but also stressed that at the next Board meeting she expects to see a more detailed report with closure in sight.

Mr. Hulsey appreciated Terry's comments and indicated her statements were accurate. The department does try to be responsive to the issues, trying to work with the committee to bring forward a consensus recommendation. He indicated that they are mindful of what the law states, and what the facts are as documented by the analysis; public comments; and agencies involved. He also confirmed that the Board will receive a proposal responsive to the facts and the law at the next meeting.

Jim Zuiches concurred, stating that the department has taken the extra steps.

Bruce Bare asked if the Board would be asked to vote on Lake Whatcom at the May meeting?

Mr. Hulsey said the Board would not be asked to vote, they will be presented with the preferred alternative.

Charlie Cortelyou's Presentation

Glen Huntingford brought up a Jefferson County quarterly update provided by Charlie Cortelyou in which Mr. Cortelyou gave a power-point presentation on trust lands. Glen thought it would be a good presentation for the Board to see in an expanded version. He asked Mr. Cortelyou if he and his staff could provide a more detailed presentation for the Board at an upcoming meeting, especially given the alternatives discussions coming up later in the year?

Mr. Cortelyou agreed to provide it.

Bruce Bare added that it would be good to see the impacts of the alternatives incorporated into the presentation, and how it might change the land.

Mr. Mackey cautioned that we don't want to jump too far ahead of the process being brought through with the sustainable harvest calculation.

July 2003 Board Meeting Date Change

Chair Zuiches indicated that the July 1, Board meeting will be moved to the week of June 23, and Maureen Malahovsky will be contacting the Board members to determine a date that will work for everyone.

PUBLIC COMMENTS FOR GENERAL ITEMS OF INTEREST

Bob Dick - American Forest Resource Council in Olympia

Mr. Dick wanted to answer a question brought up earlier about “how much timber volume went to Oregon” from last month’s timber sales. He said between 10-20% (between 5-10 mmbf). He stated that in past years, the majority of the volume DNR sold went south of the river to Oregon and some to Idaho. He doesn’t think that’s the case today. There are a number of mills in Oregon that purchased DNR timber in the past, but they are no longer there. He said it brings up an important point to think about in the planning process; big logs no longer have the demand that they have had in the past. Oregon typically has the mills that process the larger timber, but there aren’t that many in Washington State. That’s why you will see the big logs head south of the river.

Becky Kelley - Washington Environmental Council (WEC)

Ms. Kelley expressed appreciation for the SHC discussion. She said it was helpful, and it was nice to hear that there would be more information each month about the different alternatives. She brought up a question that Bruce Bare asked about the specific differences between Alternatives 1 & 2, and there was an emphasis about riparian areas and owl management. She pointed out that she thinks those are the biggest differences but she also feels that there are some other differences which were heard from the public last year, including the legacy tree policy which is the number and type of trees that are left in regeneration harvest areas. The HCP had a strict number requirement being interpreted as a percentage requirement, and on the summary chart, there use to be an explanation of what percent that was, and that isn’t portrayed any longer. She suggested that it would be helpful to see that percentage. The other issue she feels is different in Alternatives 1 & 2 is the “50-25 strategy” saying that in areas where DNR owns more than a small portion of the watershed at any one time, at least half the trees should be at least 25-years old. DNR proposed removing that policy, and Ms. Kelley thinks it would be interesting to see what the financial and environmental impacts of keeping/removing that policy would bring. She also brought up unstable slopes and Marbled Murrelets. She suggested that details are not over generalized in hopes of better understanding the complex issues, but that the details are carefully looked at.

Ms. Kelley also referenced an MOU with F&W referencing southwest Washington owls. She recalled a commitment in the MOU to look at the southwest owls as the sustainable harvest calculation moves forward and determine what can be done there. She said it would be helpful to hear about how that will be modeled in the alternatives in the coming months.

Chair Zuiches asked if anyone else present wishing to make comment before the Board? Seeing none, hearing none.

Meeting adjourned at 11:25 a.m.

Approved this ____ day of _____, 2003

Doug Sutherland, Commissioner of Public Lands

Bob Nichols for Governor Gary Locke

Bruce Bare, Dean, University of Washington

James Zuiches, Dean, Washington State University

Terry Bergeson, Superintendent of Public Instruction

Glen Huntingford, Commissioner, Jefferson County

Attest:

Maureen Malahovsky, Board Coordinator